

Severe Vesico-ureteral Reflux and Urine Sequestration: Mathematical Relations and Urodynamic Consequences.

Lisieux Eyer de Jesus^{1*}, Paulo de Faria Borges^{2†}

¹*Pediatric Surgery Department, Hospital Universitário Antonio Pedro
Av. Marques de Paraná, Centro,
20000-000 Niterói, Brazil*

¹*Hospital dos Servidores do estado, Brazilian Ministry of Health
Rio de Janeiro, Brazil*

²*Centro Federal de Educação Tecnológica Celso Suckow da Fonseca
Coordenação de Física, Av. Maracanã, 229, Maracanã,
20271-110 Rio de Janeiro, Brazil*

February 3, 2009

*lisieux@uol.com.br

†pborges@cefet-rj.br

Abstract

Some simple mathematical formulae to calculate the volumes of proximal pyeloureteral reflexive systems are presented, and the results are compared to bladder capacity values. Using the results of the calculi, the author discusses possible implications of severe urinary sequestration in the pyeloureteral systems. Using geometrical and topological approximations we calculate the volumes of ureters and renal pelvises, applying in vivo measurements obtained from conventional ultrasound, retrograde cystourethrograms and topographic anatomic references. Approximations use 2 decimals and assumed π value was 3.14. Ureteral and pyelic volumes are calculated, respectively, from the mathematical formula for the cylinder and cone volumes. Dolicomegaureter are compensated using proportional calculi. Bladder volumes are estimated from conventional formulae. Proximal urinary sequestration is compared between infants and older children with VUR. Mechanisms of direct induction of bladder urodynamic failure from VUR are suggested. Sequestration of urine in the ureter and renal pelvis can be estimated from mathematical formulae in patients with VUR. The values used derive from ultrasound examinations, CUM and topographical anatomical references. Primary VUR can determine urodynamic problems. Urine sequestration in the proximal urinary system is worse in infants than in older children.

KEY-WORDS: Vesico-ureteral reflux urodynamics infants bladder failure

LEGENDS:

VUR: vesicoureteral reflux

CUD: conventional urodynamic

VUD: videourodynamics

DUS: Dynamic ultrasound

US: conventional ultra-sound

CUM: micturating cystourethrographies

AP: antero-posterior

CT: computerized tomography

MRI: Magnetic resonance imaging

pv: pelvis volume

uv: ureteral volume

B: major cone axis

b: minor cone axis

Rul: ureteral length from CUM

Rptd: Real pelvis-trigone distance from CUM

1 INTRODUCTION

Severe vesicoureteral reflux (VUR) renders the interpretation of conventional urodynamic (CUD) tests results difficult. Urine sequestered in the ureter and renal pelvis may be summed to bladder urine and simulate a normal or even augmented bladder capacity in low volume / low compliance bladders. This phenomenon can induce serious doubts to indicate or not a bladder augmentation in dysfunctional or neuropathic bladder patients. If the clinical question is Should we augment this patient because of his low cystometric capacity? and the patient demonstrates a severe dilating VUR CUD may not give the correct answer. The same biophysical problem applies to analyze the frequent association between severe VUR and bladder dysfunction, especially in infants. In those children an empty bladder after a normal complete micturition may be immediately followed by bladder repletion with urine from the full ureters/ renal pelvises, depending on the proportion of sequestered volume in the high urinary tract to the bladder capacity and on the clearance of the proximal urinary tract. This causes high urination frequency, high bladder pressure, urinary stasis and/or bladder urodynamic decompensation, depending on the case. In patients who depend on periodic urethral catheterizations to empty the bladder (CIC) the immediate bladder re-filling after micturition determines persistent bladder stasis and its consequences (urinary tract infection UTI and urinary incontinence). The solution to this dilemma has been to substitute CUD for videourodynamics (VUD). With VUD the operator can confront bladder pressures or volumes with timely images obtained with fluoroscopy. This allows him/her to define the exact bladder capacity immediately before any reflux to the ureter (real functional bladder capacity). Nevertheless, VUD is technically difficult to obtain (especially in children), VUR is a dynamic phenomenon (VUD demonstration can vary between different bladder filling cycles) and may occur in extremely low pressures and volumes. VUD is also costly, needs specific expertise and involves relatively high radiation doses (to the patient and to the equipment operator). Active movements and the position of the patient influence the results. Dynamic ultrasound (DUS), newly described [1], is also an option, with the advantages of an easy availability of the equipment, no irradiation and a more physiologic exam. The disadvantages are the high expertise involved, long examining times, need of cooperation from the patient, recent description, limited experience with the method, high cost and variations of results between different examiners. A new answer to this problem would be to calculate the volumetric capacity of the full pyeloureteral system in each patient, and this is the prime objective of this article. Some easy formulae to calculate those volumes are presented, independently from urodynamic tests. Using this theoretical model, the author discusses possible implications of severe urinary sequestration in the pyeloureteral systems.

2 MATERIALS AND METHODS:

Using geometrical and topological approximations we calculate the volumes of ureters and renal pelvises, applying in vivo measurements obtained from conventional ultra-sound

(US) and cystourethrographies (CUM). Approximations use 2 decimals and assumed π value was 3.14.

3 RESULTS:

3.1 Preliminary data:

The renal pelvis is (geometrically) an elliptical cone. We can calculate an elliptical cone volume by the formula:

$$pv = \frac{\pi h.B.b}{3} \quad (1)$$

Considering $\pi = 3.14$,

$$pv = \frac{3.14 \times h.B.b}{3} \quad (2)$$

And

$$pv = 1.04 \times h.B.b \quad (3)$$

The highness and the base diameters of the renal pelvis are obtained by ultrasound, with a full bladder. Using this formula the pelvic volume is 1.04 multiplied by the 3 dimensions measured (highness, depth and AP diameter of the pelvis). It is absolutely necessary that the radiologist obtains those dimensions with a full bladder, to replicate the physiologic moment of a micturition/ bladder emptying and to consider diameter measurements from the pyeloureteral junction to as close as possible to the renal sinus (so as not to consider a shorter pelvis than real and obtain false low volumes).

The ureter is, geometrically, a cylinder. The formula to calculate a cylinder volume is:

$$uv = \pi r^2 h \quad (4)$$

Considering $\pi = 3.14$ and $radius(r) = diameter/2$,

$$uv = 3.14 \times \left(\frac{diameter}{2} \right)^2 h \quad (5)$$

Using Palmers approximation [2] , ureteral length may be approximated from the formula $age + 10(cm)$,

$$uv = 3.14 \times \left(\frac{diameter}{2} \right)^2 \times (age(years) + 10) \quad (6)$$

Alternatively, ureteral length (pyeloureteral junction / uretero-vesical junction) can be estimated in vivo, using classical concepts from topographic anatomy [3] , as the distance

between the superior border of the first lumbar vertebra (pyeloureteral junction) and the pubic symphysis (uretero-vesical junction).

Dolicomegaureter cases are problematic. In those patients the real ureteral extension cannot be measured directly and is bigger than topographic estimations. Cystourethrography exams (CUM) imply length variations due to the distance between patient, X-ray emission equipment and radiographic films and cannot be used to measure directly the ureteral length. We suggest that their length may be calculated using proportional formulas:

$$\frac{Rul}{Rptd} = \frac{ureteral.length.from.CUM}{Rptd.from.CUM} \quad (7)$$

$$\frac{Rul}{L1 - symphysis.distance.in.vivo} = \frac{ureteral.length.from.CUM}{L1 - symphysis.distance.from.CUM} \quad (8)$$

$$Rul = \frac{ureteral.length.in.CUM \times L1 - symphysis.distance.in.vivo}{L1 - symphysis.distance.from.CUM} \quad (9)$$

Obviously, the total volume of the urinary system proximal to the bladder corresponds to the sum of the 2 renal pelvises to the 2 ureters. Normal bladder capacity in childhood can be estimated from various formulae, that consider that the bladder grows in different paces in infants ($< 2years - old$) and older children. There are various formulae in literature. We opted here to use Koffs formula [4] for older children and Kaefers formula [5] for infants, based on their ample use, easiness and recommendations of the International Childs Continence Society [6] .

$$Age = 2years : Bladdervolume(ml) = (age(years)+2).30 \quad Age < 2years : Bladdervolume = (2.age(years) + 2) \times 30$$

Those calculations allow us to obtain some important physiopathological information:

In $a = 2$ years-old child $a > 10\%$ proximal urinary system urine sequestration (corresponding to an abnormal post-micturating residue) implies that:

$$(age + 2) \times 30 \geq (pv + uv)$$

$$\text{If the ureter is not a dolicomegaureter: } (age + 2) \times 30 > 1.04 \times h \times B \times b + 3.14 \times (r/2)^2 \times (age + 10)$$

Considering similar dimensions of proximal abnormally dilated urinary systems, urinary sequestration is proportionally more severe in infants than in older children, physically speaking:

In a 4 months-old infant presenting renal pelvis dimensions of $2 \times 1.5 \times 5$ cm and a 16cm dolicomegaureter ($> 60\%$ than the normal length for his age) and 1.6 cm diameter:

$$pv = 1.04 \times 2 \times 1.5 \times 5 = 15.6ml$$

$$uv = 3.14 \times (1.6/2) \times 2 \times 16 = 3.14 \times 0.8 \times 0.8 \times 16 = 32.15$$

$$\text{Total supra-vesical urinary system volume(T)} \quad T = 15.6 + 32.15 = 47.75$$

$$\text{Bladder calculated capacity(bcc)} \quad bcc = (2 \times 0.3 + 2) \times 30 = 78ml$$

Sequestered urine/bladder capacity(su.bc) $su.bc = 47.75/39.5 = 62\%$

In a 6 years-old male with the same pyelic dimensions and a 26 cm dolicomegaureter (> 60% than the normal length for his age) and 1.6 cm diameter:

Pelvic volume = $1.04 \times 2 \times 1.5 \times 5 = 15.6$ ml

Ureteral volume = $3.14 \times (1.6/2)^2 \times 26 = 3.14 \times 0.8 \times 0.8 \times 26 = 52.25$

Total supra-vesical urinary system volume = $15.6 + 52.25 = 67.85$

Bladder calculated capacity = $(6 + 2) \times 30 = 8 \times 30 = 240$ ml

Sequestered urine/ bladder capacity = $67.85/240 = 28.3\%$

4 DISCUSSION:

A non-contractile volumetric storage compartment coupled to the bladder augments the reservoir without a functional (contractile) correspondence. Physically, this means that the relationship between anatomical bladder volume/functional bladder volume diminishes, or that the work efficiency of the detrusor is reduced. Normal micturition begins with a neurologically mediated isovolumetric contraction of the detrusor, generating enough pressure to open the bladder sphincters. From that moment on the urine is expelled with a constant pressure maintained by the detrusor contraction (isobaric phase), sufficient to overcome the passive urethral resistance. During isovolumetric detrusor contraction, if the patient presents VUR or a big bladder diverticulum this low pressure non-contractile reserve systems store a fraction of the urinary volume to be expelled (communicating vessels principle), depending on the characteristics of the reservoir (volume of the proximal urinary systems or diverticula, presence of absence of obstructions to retrograde urine flux, position of the patient as it relates to gravity). Perhaps even more important, a non-contractile communicating system dissipate some of the energy generated by the detrusor contraction, causing a less efficient bladder systole. There are some direct consequences of this process:

1. A more intense detrusor contraction (more detrusor work) is necessary to maintain a satisfactory bladder emptying or, alternatively, higher bladder residua appear after each micturition. This may cause detrusor secondary hipertrophy, detrusor-sphincter secondary incoordination and bladder myogenic decompensation. By this mechanism, VUR may be the cause, and not the effect, of bladder dysfunction. As a matter of fact, the two defects (VUR and bladder dysfunction) feedback each other, even if we believe that a common embryological malformation could cause both the VUR and a primary urodynamic problem, secondary to trigonal and/or neural dysgenesis.
2. After a micturition, during bladder diastole, high tract sequestered urine returns to the bladder. Mechanical fluid laws attest that liquids move between two communicating systems according to pressure gradients between the two compartments. During bladder diastole the bladder has the same pressure of the abdomen and gravity facilitates bladder filling from the pelvises and ureters in orthostatic patients.

Obviously this may not apply to small infants that lie supine for the major part of the day.

3. High bladder post-micturating residua are generated from detrusor inefficiency and abnormal storage of urine in the ureters and renal pelvises. Depending on the final residual volume, bladder sensitivity and the motor efficiency of the detrusor, a new emptying cycle initiates immediately after the preceding one, worsening detrusor fatigue and progressive inefficiency. If the new emptying cycle does not occur (for example in neuropathic CIC-dependent bladders) or is inefficient, bladder urinary stasis augments the risk of UTI.

If the functional cystometric capacity, complacency or sensitivity to repletion are abnormally low those decompensation mechanisms are worsened, as the storage function of the bladder will be as jeopardized as its motor function. In those patients hydronephrosis tend to progress. Neuropathic bladders, valve bladders, small bladders and reflex bladders (typical of infants) are the most susceptible. Abnormal bladder function is common in male infants with severe VUR. Our calculations demonstrate that the dynamic implications of urinary sequestration are worse in infants than in older children. Most authors agree that VUR can be worsened or caused by bladder disfunction, but the ideas expressed here suggest that the exact inverse phenomenon may happen: bladder dysfunction may be secondary to severe dilating long-term VUR. This is a new concept, and can be a good argument to treat VUR aggressively in those patients, even without UTI. These ideas can explain the cure of bladder dysfunction after VUR endoscopic or surgical treatment reported recently from some authors [7, 8]. Yeung and cols [9], studying the urodynamic patterns of normal and severe VUR infant males describe 57% of urodynamic abnormalities in the index patients (none in the normal infants), typically high post-micturating residua, high bladder pressures and hyper active bladder pattern. Podesta et al [10] corroborate their findings while studying infants with VUR, but do not report bladder dyastole problems. Sillen et al [11] present 2 types of urodynamic abnormalities in VUR infant patients, emphasizing that low capacity hyper dynamic bladders are characteristic of males. Infants frequently present an immature bladder-sphincteric coordination, but normal infants do not present high urinary residua. In another article, Yeung et al [12] document abnormally thick bladder walls in infants with VUR. Our calculations evaluated more exactly the high tract sequestration, and compared it to bladder capacity. Our results may suggest therapeutic manoeuvres (pharmacological or surgical bladder augmentation, timed voiding, VUR active treatment, ureterostomy, vesicostomy, nocturnal continuous bladder catheterization) to be indicated in some patients before severe consequences of reflux appear. Sequestration $> 20\%$ of the bladder capacity probably means a high urodynamic risk: as a matter of fact, International Childrens Continence Society has recently suggested that $> 20ml$ residua in children is abnormal, and in adults $> 10\%$ post-voiding residua are considered dangerous [5] There is at least one manuscript attesting the cure of serious urodynamic problems after VUR treatment, without any other therapeutic measures, in a patient presenting with $> 50\%$ bladder

capacity urinary sequestration [8]. Mialdea and colleagues have described a posterior urethral valve-like syndrome, presenting VUR -associated to uncoordinated fetal voiding in male infants and suggest that a vesicostomy can simultaneously cure VUR and urodynamic abnormalities in 2/7 babies[13] The usage of our formulae can be complementary to VUD, and corroborate its results The logistical problems with the exam, especially concerning neurologically normal infants, radiation exposure, high cost of the equipment and low availability of experts, mainly in poor countries or non-reference smaller hospitals [12, 14], render the direct calculations attractive, at least as an initial triage of patients who should be referenced to surgical treatment or evaluation. This mathematical model, though logical, needs to be tested clinically. Ideally the calculations should be confronted to direct measurements taken with image exams (*3dCTorMRI*), as in vivo direct measurements cannot be done. Limited clinical indications of those exams in VUR patients, radiation exposure and the needing for sedation create ethical and practical problems to obtain those data. Another problem is that there are some different formulae proposed to calculate normal bladder capacity in children. We opted to use a formula for infants and another for *children = 2years – old*, as various authors have already demonstrated the logarithmic bladder growth in childhood, with an accelerated period during infancy. Bael and cols suggested that bladder capacities are similar before and after VUR cure, not relating to VUR grade or laterality, and proved that refluxing volumes correlate primarily with reflux grades (and, supposedly, ureteral and pyelic dilation)[15]. Kaefers formula was suggested after a clinical study with > 2000 children [5] and Koffs formula [4] has been recently adopted by the International Childrens Continence Society [6].

5 CONCLUSION:

Sequestration of urine in the ureter and pelvis can be estimated from mathematical formulae in patients with VUR. The values used derive from ultrasound examinations, CUM and topographical anatomical references. VUR can determine directly urodynamic problems. Implications of urine sequestration in the proximal urinary system are worse in infants than in older children.

References

- [1] Filgueiras, MFTF; Lima, EM; Sanchez, TM; Goulart, EMA; Menezes, AC; Pires, CR. Bladder dysfunction: diagnosis with dynamic US. Radiology 2003,227:340-4.
- [2] Palmer, JS; Palmer, LS. Determining the proper stent length to use in children: age plus 10. J Urol 2007, 178(4):1566-9
- [3] Testut, L; Jacob, O. Trait DAnatomie Topographique Avec Applications Mdico-Chirurgicales. Paris, Librairie Octave Doin. 1re edition. Vol 2, p 324-37, 1922.
- [4] Koff, SA. Estimating bladder capacity in children. J Urol 1983, 21:248-90.

- [5] Kaefer, M; Zurakowski, D; Bauer, SB; Retik, AB; Peters, CA; Atala, A; Treves, ST. Estimating normal bladder capacity in children. *J Urol* 1997, 158(6):2261-4.
- [6] Neveus, T; von Gontard, A; Hoebeke, P; Hjalmas, K; Bauer, S; Bower, W; Jorgensen, TM et al. The standardization of terminology of lower urinary tract function in children and adolescents: report from the standardization committee of the International Childrens Continence Society. *J Urol* 2006, 176:314-24.
- [7] Lackgren, G; Skldenberg, E; Stenberg, A. Endoscopic treatment with stabilized nonanimal hyaluronic acid/dextranomer gel is effective in vesicoureteral reflux associated with bladder dysfunction. *J Urol* 2007, 177(3):1124-9.
- [8] Musquera Felip, M; Errando Smet, C; Prados Saavedra, M; Arao Bertrn, P; Villavicencio Mavrich, H. Falso residuo postmiccional diagnosticado por videourodinamia. *Acatas Urol Esp* 2004, 28(10):792-5.
- [9] Yeung, CK, Godley, ML; Dhillon, HK; Gordon, I; Duffy, PG; Ransley, PG. The characteristics of primary vesicoureteral reflux in male and female infants with prenatal hydronephrosis. *Br J Urol* 1997, 80:319-27.
- [10] Podesta, ML; Castera, R; Ruarte, AC. Videourodynamic findings in Young infants with severe primary reflux. *J Urol* 2004, 171:829-33.
- [11] Sillen, U; Hellstron, G; Hermanson, G; Abrahamson, K. Comparison of urodynamic and free voiding pattern in infants with dilating reflux. *J Urol* 1999, 161:1928-33.
- [12] Yeung, CK; Godley, ML; Dhillon, HK; Duffy, PG; Ransley, PG. Urodynamic patterns in infants with normal lower urinary tracts or primary vesico-ureteric reflux. *Br J Urol* 1998, 81(3):461-7.
- [13] Mialdea, RL; Martin-Crespo, R. Reflujo vesicoureteral bilateral grave y nefropatia renal en pacientes varones recién nacidos : síndrome de válvulas-like o miccin no coordinada en el feto varn. *Arch Esp Urol* 2008, 61(2):173-9.
- [14] McGuire, EJ; Cespedes, RD; Cross, CA; OConnell, HE. Videourodynamic studies. *Urol Clin North Am* 1996, 23(2):309-21.
- [15] Bael, AM; Lax, H; Hirche, H; Hjalms, K; Tamminen-Mbius, T et al. Reference ranges for cystographic bladder capacity in children: with special attention to vesicoureteral reflux. *J Urol* 2006, 176(4):1596-600.